2 applications relating to Ballia District and 7 applications relating to Jaunpur District of Uttar Pradesh were pending for the grant of industrial licence to set up industrial units in the said districts.

As per the new Industrial Policy, industrial licensing has been abolished for all projects except for a short list of industries related to security and strategic concerns etc. The proposals requiring industrial licensing are at various stages of processing as per established proce, dure.

Licence to M|s. Apex Traders Pvt. Ltd,, Sahibabad

1600. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a tact that an F. P. O. licence has been issued by the Director (F and VP Department of his Ministry) to M|s. Apex Traders Pvt. Ltd. Sahibabad on 6th June, 1991 with the condition that no products licensed by Pepsi Foods will be allowed to be manufactured;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether this condition is being incorporated in every FPO licences granted to Sweet and Aerated Water Manufacturers and if so, since when;. and

(d) whether any new bottling units licgnsed to manufacture Pepsi products have been put up and if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE (IN DEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD PROCES SING INDUSTRIES (SHRI GIRI DHAR GOMANGO): (a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Per Head Central Allocation to States

1601. MAULANA OBAIDULLAH. KHAN AZMI: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be leased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 170 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) the details of per head central allocation to different states and Union Territories State-wise during the last two years year-wise, and during the current year;

(b) whether it is a fact that there is a manifold difference in the pen head allocation to some States as compared to that of U.P. and Bihar;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) the steps being taken to ra tionalise the gap and to ensure bal anced growth and development of all States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN DEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE, MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H. R, BHARDWAJ): (a) State-wise and U. T.-wise per head Central allocations during 1989-90, 1990-91 and 1991-92 are shown in the Statements I and II attached respectively.

(b) to (d) No. Sir. Some varia tions rejected in the allocations of U.P. and Biher compared to other-non-special category States are for 1989 90 and 1990-91 is due to their relative shares emerging on the basis of the modified Gadgil Formula approved by N D.C. in August. 1980 and the revised formula declared as consensus formula in the National Development Council meeting held in October, 3990 for the allocations during the Eighth Plan 1990-95 including 1991-92. Allocations to Special Category States are based on the judgement of their needs, not made according to criteria and comeout of the lump sum amount specified out of the total. Non-special category, States including U.P. and Bihar having per capita income below the national average got favourable treatment in the allocations. In the ease of Goa which obtained its Statehood in February, 1987, marked variation is because of Central assistance allotted on adhoc basis during 1987-88 to 1990-91.

Statement-I

Per Head Central Allocation of criteri-based Normal Assistance to States during 1989-90 1990-91 *and* 1991-92

(Rupees)

States	1989-90	1990-91	1991-992
A—*Special Category States*			
1. Arunachal Pradesh	3025	3519	5021
2. Assam	425	430	514
3. Himachal Pradesh	552	637	746
4. Jammu & Kashmir	1187	1212	1550
5. Manipur	1256	1454	1819
6. Meghalaya	1283	1465	1759
7. Mizoram	2526	3160	4578
8. Nagaland	2036	2425	3202
9. Sikkim	2882	3243	4210
10. Tripura	925	1053	1257
B—*Non-Special Category States*			
1. Andhra Pradesh	98	103	125
2. Bihar	109	114	139
3. Goa	1258	1258	560
4. Gujarat	72	76	88
5. Haryana	77	103	118
6. Karnataka	77	80	92
7. Kerala	118	124	141
8. Madhya Pradesh	99	104	124
9. Maharashtra	67	70	85
10. Orissa	124	129	156
11. Punjab	60	85	129
12. Rajasthan	128	134	149
13. Tamil Nadu	88	98	109
14. Uttar Pradesh	97	118	124
15. West Bengal	67	71	86

*Based on modified Gpdgil formula
**Based on NDC 'Consensus' formula

Note: per head allocations based en 1971 population

Statement—II

Per head Allocation of Normal Assistance to Union Territories during 1989-90, 1990-9) and 1991 92

(Rupees)

Sl. No.	Union Territory	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	3049	3697	5889
2.	Chandigarh	797	866	1012
3.	Dadra Nagar Haveli	830	975	1614
4.	Daman & Diu	1295	1320	1698
5.	Delhi	740	955	1098
6.	Lakshadweep	4313	4519	4716
7.	Pondicherry	855	949	1153

Note: Per head allocations are based on budget estimates of Central Assistance and 1971 population.

Duplication of R & D Projects

1802. SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether any study has been carried but to assess duplication of R&D projects being supported by various technical departments;

(b) if so, the details thereof in terms of projects, agency, amount and output;

(c) if not, by when such a study would be available; and

(d) what checks are there to avoid funding of similar R and D projects at the same institution by different technical departments and international agencies?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SMT. MARGARET ALVA): (a) to (d) The Government has made an analysis to assess duplication of R and D projects being supported by vari&us technical departments, in order to evolve an Integrated Approach to promoting R&D activities.